DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 157 946 TM 007 536

AUTHOR Celio, Mary Beth; And Others
TITLE The Development of a Measure of Attitudes Toward Age. Research Report # 8-77.
INSTITUTION Maryland Univ., College Park. Counseling Center.
PUB DATE [77]
NOTE 17p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Development; Adults; *Age; *Age Differences; *Attitude Tests; *Bias; Educational Background; Older Adults; *Predictor Variables; Sex Differences; Situational Tests; *Social Attitudes; Stereotypes; Young Adults
IDENTIFIERS *Situational Attitude Scale Age

ABSTRACT

The Situational Attitude Scale-Age (SASA) was developed to measure attitudes toward older individuals, using a specific set of situations to which respondents react either as actors or spectators. Each of the ten situational statements are followed by bi-polar semantic differential scales. Three forms of the SASA were developed containing the same situations and scales. Form A made no reference to age; the word "older" was inserted in form B statements; and form C statements specified age in years. Test items are appended. The tests were administered to 112 individuals in the University of Maryland Student Services Office, and at a private research firm. Twenty-three of the 100 items were significant and seventeen of the responses to age-indicated forms were not significant to each other, but were different from the age-neutral test responses. Analysis of variance by age, sex and level of education revealed that the older the respondent, the more positive the response to age-indicated tests. The sex of the respondent was significant in seven situations and educational level was in three. Females, older respondents, and those with less education had the most positive attitudes toward age. Paricipants consistently showed more positive responses towards older persons and did not distinguish between "older" and specific age. Suggestions for future research are included. (Author/JAC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

COUNSELING CENTER

Office of Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

College Park, Maryland

DEVELOPMENT OF A CHECKLIST OF
ATTITUDES TOWARD AGE

Mary Beth Celio, William E. Sedlacek
and Nancy K. Schlossberg

Research Report # 5-77

MOO7 536

COUNSELING CENTER
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
COLLEGE PARK, MARYLAND

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A MEASURE OF ATTITUDES TOWARD AGE

Mary Beth Celio, William E. Sedlacek and Nancy K. Schlossberg

Research Report # 8-77

Summary

The Situational Attitude Scale - Age (SASA) was developed to measure attitudes toward older individuals. To provide a specific set of situations to which respondents could react, ten statements were drawn up involving the respondent either as an actor (i.e., having to take action in a given situation) or a spectator. Each situation was followed by ten bi-polar scales. Three forms of the SASA were developed. Each contains the same situations, bipolar scales and instructions, except that the word "older" was inserted in Form B, while Form C contained a specific age.

Results showed that 23 of the 100 items were significant at the .05 level. Participants consistently showed more positive responses toward older persons in the situations and did not distinguish between "older" and a specific age.

Results are discussed and suggestions for further research made.

The measurment of attitudes toward minority groups - whether ethnic, racial or sexual- has increased markedly over the last decade as sensitivity to the status of these groups has grown. In the case of attitudes toward age, the growing consciousness and the accompanying measurement of attitudes has been especially notable in the last five years. Increasing numbers of sociologists, psychologists and other social scientists have attempted to determine the attitudes of various populations to the aging and the aged. In some cases, this interest appears to have been primarily finding out what has been done (Weinberger and Millham, 1975; Collette-Pratt, 1976; Kilty and Field, 1976; Rosen and Jerdee, 1976). In other cases, there has appeared to be a realization that measuring attitudes can lead to an awareness of ways in which these attitudes may affect behavior and thus an emphasis on "next steps" - how to combat attitudes which are translated into unjustly restrictive actions (Troll and Schlossberg, 1975).

One of the greatest problems in the measurement of attitudes toward age (as opposed to attitudes about race, ethincity or sex) is that the referrant group is not unitary (i.e., "elderly" or "older" is a relative rather than an absolute state, unlike "black" or "female "). An individual's attitudes toward older people will be influenced by how "older" is defined and how one views the fact that age is something that happens to everyone.

As the proportion of students are spanning the age spectrum, it becomes increasingly important to assess the attitudes of faculty, administrators, staff and students toward people older than themselves. A number of different approaches to measuring attitudes toward age exist, each with its own limitations. These various approaches will be described, after which a new measurement approach will be outlined.

Troll and Schlossberg (1975) developed an instrument known as the Age Norms Inquiry, based on an earlier measurement tool (Neugarten, Moore and Lowe, 1965). In this more recent instrument, subjects were asked to assign age limits to specific life situations, such as "It is all right for a woman to have her last child from ___ to ____," and "A man should hold his top job from ____ to ____." In one research use of this instrument, the respondent was given a choice of three age groups to fill in the blanks, and "age bias" was defined operationally as the choice of either of the two younger age ranges listed. Lack of bias would be shown in the respondent's choice of the oldest age range, if the question remained unanswered, if all three choices were checked, or if a comment was entered to the effect that age is irrelevant. In other words, there is an assumption that for those who follow the directions and respond with anything but the oldest range, there is evidence of bias.

Weinberger and Millham (1975) measured attitude toward two "individuals", one a representative 25-year-old , and the other a representative 70-year-old. The 25-year-old is the control, and differences in attitudes toward the younger and the older subject can be attributed to age rather than to intervening variables. In this particular study, the first measurement of attitudes was accomplished by asking the respondents to rate the otherwise undefined "representative" 25-year-old and 70-year-old on a five point Likert scale ("high" to "not at all") in these categories: general satisfaction; personality characteristics, both negative and positive; level of dependence; and adjustments and adaptability. Another measurment approach adopted by Weinberger and Millham involved detailed autobiographies of a 25-year-old and a 70-year-old. After reading one of these, the respondents were asked to evaluate the individual along eight dimensions: intellectual capacity, self-acceptance, satisfaction with life, contribution (either actual or potential) to society, psychological adjustment; adaptability; appeal of the person, and overall worth.

As might be expected, the respondents were more negative toward "conceptual" age (that is, in their judgments of disembodied 70-year-old in terms of the abstract concepts of "general satisfaction," etc.) than "situational " age (e.g., in their evaluation of the adaptability of a 70-year-old who has been described in terms of his/her life situation). Here the problem of "relative" age has been handled by specifying the age of the subject, but an even greater problem remains. When respondents react to abstract concepts and an abstract individual, to what are they actually responding? This question is raised most pointedly in a study (Collette-Pratt, 1976) which purported to investigate the viability of the "three major explanations of devaluation of old age." The author used a semantic differential technique to measure attitudes toward seven target concepts: poor health, social isolation, death, financial insecurity, achievement, independence, and personal productivity. The scales used were good-bad, optimistic-pessimistic, complete-incomplete, timely-untimely, positive-negative, successful-unsuccessful, important-unimportant. A comparison point was established by also asking the respondents to rate the concepts of youth, middle age and old age, and by then using the combined score as a reflection of the respondent's attitude toward "age in general." The results showed a discrepancy between theory and the results of the research. Presentation of abstract concepts may not, in fact, be the most effective way of eliciting the attitudes towards characteristics of age and the aged because it is uncertain whether the reaction recorded is to the concept presented as it relates to others, or the concept as it relates to self.

Kilty and Field (1976) explored the underlying dimensionality of beliefs about aging by using items from the Tuchman and Lorge (1952b, 1953) Old People Scale, the Tuchman and Lorge (1952a) Older Worker's Scale, Kogan's (1961) Old People Scale, and Srole's (1956) Alienation Scale. Respondents indicated

their attitudes toward the situations and opinions on a seven-point scale ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." Forty-five statements were used, including such items as "older people worry about financial security," and "older people hold on to their opinions." Here again we see that indefinite referrant - "older people." This may bause some problems; others may arise from the fact there is no control group or norms against which the respondets' atttitudes can be compared.

A study by Golde and Kogan (1953), conducted much earlier than the others, also appears to have a number of attraccive and useful features. The study tested the hypothesis that attitudes toward "old people" are qualitatively different from those concerning the broader class of "people in general." Twenty-five matched "experimental-control" sentence stems were presented to study participants for completion. In one set, the stem was not age specific (e.g., "Most peoples' friendships are ..."); in the other, the term "old" was added (e.g., "One of the greatest fears of many old people is ..."). Content analysis was then performed and it was found that the specific terms in which old people are described differ substantially from the terms applied to people as a whole. What should be noted here is that the undefined "old" which was used throughout was sufficient to evoke significantly more negative responses than the neutral category.

The discussion above pointed out some of the problems inherent in the measurment of attitudes toward age and some of the more successful approaches used in the past. The current study used a semantic differential technique in response to a situation rather than to an abstract concept (age) or a simple descriptor. In addition, attitudes toward the older person were compared to attitudes toward a control group: People in general. The semantic differential technique permits the measurement of connotative meanings of situations through generating reactions to bipolar word scales, and has worked well in

the measurement of racial attitudes (Sedlacek and Brooks, 1970, 1972), attitudes toward women (Herman and Sedlacek, 1973) and toward commuter students (Lea and Sedlacek, 1977 and handicapped students (Webster and Sedlacek, 1977). Because of the fact that age and "older" are relative, the study also investigated the question of whether the introduction of a specific age or age range is more effective in eliciting attitudes than the use of a more general descriptor such as "older."

Procedure

The Situational Attitude Scale - Age (SASA) was developed to measure attitudes toward older individuals. To provide a specific set of situations to which respondents could react, ten statements were drawn up involving the respondent as either an actor (i.e., having to take an action in a given situation) or a spectator (see Table 1). Each situation was followed by ten scales, each of which was a bipolar scale (Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum, 1957). Thus the SASA was made up of 100 items (see Table 2). Three forms of the SASA were developed. Each contains the same situations, bipolar scales and instructions, except that the word "older" was inserted in Form B, and a specific age was inserted in Form C, while Form A made no reference to age. The positive pole for each item was varied randomly from right to left to avoid response set.[1]

The SASA was administered to 112 individuals in student service offices at the University of Maryland, College Park, and a private research firm which does extensive educational research and which is made up largely of professionals with graduate degrees in social sciences or liberal arts. Each respondent had an approximately equal chance to receive Form A, B or C, and subjects had no knowledge that different forms existed.

---

[1]Tables 1 and 2 contain all the information in the questionnaires. Those wishing copies should write to William Sedlacek, Counseling Center, University of Maryland, College Park 20742.

Of the respondents, 39% were under 29, 32% were between 30 and 39, 15% were between 40 and 49, and 11% were over 50. Thirty percent of the respondents were men and 68 % were women. Also 22% had less than a BA or BS degree, 17% had only a baccalaureate degree, 37% had a master's degree, and 21% had a doctorate. Demographic data were not available for 3% of the respondents.

Differences in responses to the forms were analyzed by analysis of variance (fixed effect- .05 level) and Student-Newman-Keuls post hoc tests at .05

Results

Table 2 shows the results of the analysis of variance for Forms A, B and C. Twenty-three of the 100 items were significant at the .05 level. For 17 of the 23 significant items, responses to the age-indicated forms (B and C) were not significantly different from each other, but were different from the age-neutral form (Form A). Another item (42) indicated this same trend, but post hoc differences were not significant. Since one would expect only nine tests to be significant at the .05 level due to chance out of 100 tests made (Sakoda, Cohen and Beall, 1954), there is some indication that the introduction of an age-reference in a situation will alter the response of an individual to that situation.

Discussion and Conclusion

Participants consistently showed more positive responses toward older persons in the situations and did not distinguish between "older" and a specific age. In an effort to go beyond this pro-age bias, further analyses of variance by age, sex and education were conducted. Because of widely varying cell sizes the analysis was considered tentative for the purpose of generating future hypotheses and research.

Generally the older the respondent, the more positive was their reaction to forms B and C. Males tended to be more negative and disapproving whether the situation was a career change, a student asking for an application to

graduate school, or a colleague entering psychoanalysis while the less educated respondents were more cautious and "constrained" regarding career change, but felt more "aggressive" and positive in meeting a competitor for a job. Age of the respondents was significant in three situations, sex in seven, and education in three.

It is not clear as to what may account for the results. It may be because the respondents work in an educational environment which is possibly more attuned to the needs of older individuals, or because the situations did not provide the opportunity to express any negative feelings toward age. The SAS method itself may be unable to detect attitudes in this area, although it has apprently been useful in assessing other types of negative attitudes. Of course, it could also be that negative "ageism" is a myth and that people tend to have positive attitudes toward older persons. This latter possible conclusion, however, does not seem to match the realities faced by older persons in our society and education system.

A number of additional studies seem to be clearly called for. Specifically, new situations could be devised which would provide more threatening circumstances or which could make the situation more immediate to the respondent. It may also be possible that "older" and the specific ages used (between 39 and 65) were more neutral (and thus less likely to elicit strong feelings) than terms such as "elderly" or ages over 65. Because the older respondents, females, and those with less education seemed more positive toward age and/or the person described in most situations, this interaction should be studied further. It may also be fruitful to study the attitudes of the individuals such as young students since they will be interacting with increasing numbers of older students at many institutions. The attitudes of individuals completely outside education should also be studied.

In addition, no data are available on overt behavioral differences among the subjects. That is, we would be unable to predict any differences in behavior when a person actually did break into line in front of a respondent from this questionnaire. However, limited though this study was, it may provide a beginning for a more thorough investigation of attitudes toward older individuals among educators and others in our society.

Table 1.

Instructions and Situations From the Situational Attitude Scale - Age

Instructions

S.A.S.A.

This questionnaire measures how people think and feel about a number of social and personal incidents and situations. It is not a test, so there are no right or wrong answers. The questionnaire is anonymous, so PLEASE DO NOT SIGN YOUR NAME.

Each item or situation is followed by ten descriptive word scales. Your task is to select, for each situation, the rating which best reflects your feelings about that situation, or which you feel best describes the situation.

For example, if the situation was "Asking for a raise," two of the scales might look like this:

nervous	|A | B | C | D | E|	relaxed
rash	|A | B | C | D | E|	cautious

You would indicate the direction and extent of your feelings (e.g., if you would be extremly nervous or think such a move would be very rash, you might select "A" for both scales by circling option "A" in the appropriate spaces for those word scales.

Please make each situation and each scale with the situation a separate and independent judgment. Do not look back and forth through the items and respond as honestly as possible without puzzling over individual items. Respond with your first impressions whereever possible, and PLEASE RESPOND TO ALL WORD SCALES.

Table 1 - Continued

Situations		Substitute Terms	
	Form A	Form B	Form C
I	You find out that a friend is getting married for the first time.	an older friend	a 60-year-old friend
II	You hear that a friend has decided to change careers from salesperson to sociologist.	an older friend	friend who is 55 years old
III	A student comes into your office and asks for an application to graduate school.	an older student	a 55-year-old student
IV	You have just learned that you have been passed up for promotion and that a coworker has been given the promotion instead.	an older coworker	a 55-year-old coworker
V	You are asked to provide a reference for a friend who intends to go back to school to get a bachelor's degree.	an older friend	a 50-year-old friend
VI	You read about a student who is applying to dental school.	an older student	a 39-year-old student
VII	You hear that a coworker is going to undergo psychoanalysis.	an older coworker	coworker who is 60 years old
VIII	You talk to a man who plans to quit a good job as a teacher to run for public office.	an older man	a 60-year-old man
IX	You are applying for a highly competitive job and you meet your major competitor before the final interview.	an older person	a person who is 55 years old
X	You are standing in line for theater tickets and someone breaks into line ahead of you.	an older person	a 65-year-old person

Table 2.

MEANS*, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND F VALUES FOR ALL FORMS

Item No.	SITUATIONS[a] BIPOLAR ADJECTIVES	FORM A (N=34) Mean	S.D.	FORM B (N=42) Mean	S.D.	FORM C (N=36) Mean	S.D.	Significant Form Differ. (.05)
	I. Friend getting married							
1.	happy-sad	1.85	1.02	1.26	0.45	1.44	0.77	AxC, AxB
2	approving-disapproving	2.06	0.92	1.49	0.64	1.25	0.60	AxB, AxC
3	repelled-attracted	3.64	0.85	4.00	0.77	4.00	1.04	
4	pessimistic-optimistic	3.56	1.35	3.86	0.84	4.11	1.09	
5	humorous-serious	3.41	1.02	3.52	1.19	3.26	1.40	
6	negative-positive	3.71	1.14	4.29	0.89	4.42	1.02	AxB, AxC
7	unconventional-conventional	3.62	0.82	3.64	0.98	2.53	1.28	AxC, BxC
8	contented-discontented	2.53	0.99	2.07	0.87	1.92	0.91	AxB, AxC
9	unconcerned-concerned	3.79	0.84	3.38	1.06	3.08	1.20	AxC
10	annoyed-pleased	4.06	0.81	4.38	0.79	4.44	0.91	
	II. Friend changes careers from salesperson to sociologist							
11	meaningless-meaningful	3.88	1.01	4.19	1.09	4.30	0.98	
2	approving-disapproving	2.29	1.06	1.74	0.89	1.75	1.08	AxB, AxC
3	positive-negative	2.18	0.87	1.83	0.88	1.69	1.06	
4	pessimistic-optimistic	3.62	1.16	3.74	1.01	3.69	1.37	
5	accepting-rejecting	2.00	0.95	1.69	0.95	1.67	1.12	
16	uncertain-certain	3.21	1.01	3.36	0.93	3.02	1.11	
17	risky-cautious	2.65	0.85	2.61	0.96	2.50	1.06	
18	interested-disinterested	1.91	1.03	1.55	0.74	1.69	1.06	
19	destructive-productive	3.82	0.90	4.04	0.78	3.92	0.97	
20	constrained-free	3.53	0.75	3.71	1.02	3.81	1.17	
	III. Student asks for application to graduate school							
21	sad-happy	3.82	0.94	4.33	0.85	4.19	0.95	AxB
22	approving-disapproving	1.79	0.73	1.59	0.86	1.56	0.73	
23	repelled-attracted	3.85	0.89	4.17	0.82	4.17	0.85	
24	amused-serious	4.03	0.90	3.95	0.91	4.03	1.08	
25	active-passive	2.00	0.78	2.12	0.89	1.83	1.06	
26	unconventional-conventional	3.32	0.73	2.98	0.95	2.69	1.31	AxC
27	disinterested-interested	4.29	0.91	4.29	0.74	4.33	0.86	
28	impatient-patient	4.06	0.92	4.21	0.78	4.33	0.83	
29	unconcerned-concerned	4.17	0.72	3.97	0.81	4.00	1.10	
30	cold-warm	4.24	0.78	4.21	0.90	4.33	0.93	
	IV. Passed up for promotion; coworker gets promotion							
31.	anxious-calm	1.85	1.05	2.48	1.06	2.64	1.36	AxB, AxC
32	contented-disturbed	4.50	0.66	4.02	0.87	3.64	1.33	AxB, AxC
33	resentful-accepting	2.32	1.15	2.55	1.06	2.83	1.28	
34	indifferent-hostile	3.71	0.94	3.43	0.83	3.19	0.98	
35	unconcerned-concerned	4.62	0.49	4.23	0.73	3.80	1.06	AxB, AxC, BxC

* Scale A to E (numerical equivalent, 1 to 5)

[a] Full situations given in Table 1.

Table 2 - continued

MEANS*, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND F VALUES FOR ALL FORMS

ITEM NO.	SITUATIONS[a] BIPOLAR ADJECTIVES	FORM A (N=34) Mean	S.D.	FORM B (N=42) Mean	S.D.	FORM C (N=36) Mean	S.D.	Significant Form Diffe. (.05)
	IV. Passed up for promotion; coworker gets promotion							
36	positive-negative	3.74	1.05	3.76	0.93	3.25	1.23	
37	approving-disapproving	3.85	0.82	3.67	0.98	3.31	1.24	
38	aggressive-defensive	3.38	1.23	3.40	1.2.	3.17	1.23	
39	secure-fearful	3.91	0.7[illegible]	3.40	1.06	3.06	1.19	AxB,AxC
40	inferior-superior	2.35	0.81	2.64	0.96	2.71	0.93	
	V. Reference for friend going back to school							
41	annoyed-pleased	4.29	0.87	4.80	0.51	4.69	0.62	AxB,AxC
42	good-bad	1.68	0.77	1.32	0.57	1.33	0.63	no pair
43	meaningless-meaningfull	4.36	0.70	4.49	0.75	4.44	0.84	
44	approving-disapproving	1.53	0.66	1.37	0.49	1.39	0.77	
45	positive-negative	1.74	0.86	1.32	0.47	1.36	0.49	AxB,AxC
46	constrained-free	3.71	1.00	4.05	1.00	4.11	1.01	
47	aggressive-defensive	2.59	0.74	2.73	0.55	2.67	0.86	
48	conventional-unconventional	2.79	0.91	2.88	0.93	3.58	1.13	AxC,BxC
49	disinterested-interested	4.44	0.86	4.44	0.78	4.44	0.97	
50	certain-uncertain	2.00	0.85	2.10	1.02	2.08	1.16	
	VI. Student applying for dental school							
51	warm-cold	2.50	0.90	1.90	0.94	1.86	1.17	AxB,AxC
52	sad-happy	3.59	0.78	4.20	0.75	4.06	0.98	AxB,AxC
53	disapproving-approving	3.74	0.75	4.22	0.85	4.11	1.06	
54	easy-difficult	3.32	0.77	3.66	1.22	3.58	1.44	
55	attracted-repelled	2.50	0.66	2.07	0.79	2.00	0.93	AxB,AxC
56	weary-refreshed	3.35	0.73	3.83	0.89	3.78	1.20	
57	amused-serious	3.70	0.85	3.63	0.83	3.67	1.15	
58	pleased-annoyed	2.24	0.82	1.78	0.85	1.89	0.92	
59	worried-relieved	3.03	0.39	3.07	0.57	2.83	0.88	
60	destructive-productive	3.62	0.85	4.10	0.70	3.94	0.95	AxB
	VII. Colleague going to psychoanalysis							
61	meaningless-meaningfull	4.03	1.06	3.83	1.38	3.97	1.25	
62	positive-negative	2.38	1.16	2.39	1.20	2.41	1.32	
63	amused-serious	4.21	0.99	4.00	1.02	3.89	1.09	
64	resentful-accepting	4.30	0.77	4.37	0.77	4.11	1.06	
65	constrained-free	3.48	0.71	3.85	1.01	3.64	1.29	
66	productive-destructive	2.21	0.93	2.05	1.00	2.31	1.24	
67	unconcerned-concerned	4.21	0.73	3.93	1.13	3.94	1.19	
68	useless-useful	3.85	1.08	3.88	1.21	3.58	1.27	
69	certain-uncertain	2.94	1.13	2.88	1.14	2.81	1.21	
70	pessimistic-optimistic	3.82	0.97	3.70	1.12	3.50	1.28	

* Scale A to E (numerical equivalent, 1 to 5)
[a] Full situations given in Table 1.

Table 2 - continued

MEANS*, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND F VALUES FOR ALL FORMS

Item No.	SITUATIONS[a] BIPOLAR ADJECTIVE	FORM A (N=34) Mean	S.D.	FORM B (N=42) Mean	S.D.	FORM C (N=36) Mean	S.D.	Significant Form Differ. (.05)
	VIII. Man quit good job to run for public office							
71	bad-good	3.21	1.04	3.93	1.01	3.64	1.22	AxB
72	foolish-wise	3.00	0.82	3.46	0.92	3.19	1.04	
73	amused-serious	3.82	1.05	3.85	1.01	3.42	1.16	
74	disinterested-interested	4.06	0.85	4.07	0.98	4.08	1.05	
75	free-constrained	2.76	0.78	2.36	1.07	2.42	1.05	
76	unconventional-conventional	2.56	0.82	2.63	0.94	2.31	1.06	
77	weary-refreshed	3.38	0.92	3.61	0.89	3.53	1 18	
78	pleased-annoyed	2.35	0.81	2.39	1.02	2.28	1.03	
79	resentful-accepting	3.76	0.85	4.02	0.79	3.78	1.10	
80	cautious-rash	2.74	0.99	3.07	0.91	3.14	1.07	
	IX. Applying for a competitive job, meet competitor							
81	warm-cold	2.73	1.14	2.62	0.94	2.69	1.14	
82	aggressive-defensive	2.79	1.07	3.07	0.87	2.58	1.00	
83	bad-good	3.21	0.98	3.21	0.84	3.56	0.97	
84	positive-negative	2.82	1.16	2.67	1.03	2.25	1.00	
85	amused-serious	3.94	0.95	3.83	0.91	3.83	1.11	
86	discontented-contented	3.35	0.99	3.11	0.94	3.44	1.03	AxC
87	interested-disinterested	1.67	0.68	1.90	0.79	1.72	0.74	
88	accepting-resentful	2.74	1.11	2.59	1.13	2.31	1.21	
89	concerned-unconcerned	1.70	0.91	2.00	0.86	2.03	1.00	
90	indifferent-hostile	3.09	0.75	3.02	0.75	2.94	0.95	
	X. Standing in line; person breaks in							
91	approving-disapproving	4.62	0.49	4.50	0.94	4.42	0.97	
92	negative-positive	1.65	1.07	1.71	1.07	1.97	1.23	
93	anxious-calm	2.52	1.08	2.57	1.17	2.66	1.26	
94	pleased-annoyed	4.71	0.46	4.67	0.57	4.39	0.90	
95	uncertain-certain	3.56	1.02	3.50	1.25	3.25	1.27	
96	active-passive	2.21	0.98	2.50	1.13	2.61	1.34	
97	discontented-contented	1.82	0.94	1.79	1.03	1.97	1.11	
98	concerned-unconcerned	1.88	0.88	2.00	1.10	2.17	1.08	
99	safe-threatened	3.24	0.98	3.21	1.09	3.00	1.22	
00	bad-good	2.00	0.82	2.07	1.07	1.92	0.97	

* Scale A to E (numerical equivalent, 1 to 5)
[a] Full situations given in Table 1.

References

Collette-Pratt, C. Attitudinal predictors of devaluation of old age in a multigenerational sample. Journal of Gerontology, 1976, 31, 193-197.

Foster, M.D., Sedlacek, W.E. and Hardwick, M.W. Student affairs staff attitudes toward students living off campus. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1977, 18, 291-297.

Golde, P. and Kogan, N. A sentence completion procedure for assessing attitudes toward old people. Journal of Gerontology, 1959, 14, 355-363.

Herman, M.H. and Sedlacek, W.E. Sexist attitudes among male university students, Journal of College Student Personnel, 1973, 14, 544-548.

Kilty, K.M. and Field, A. Attitudes toward aging and toward the needs of older people. Journal of Gerontology, 1976, 31, 586-594.

Kogan, N. Attitudes toward old people: The development of a scale and an examination of correlates. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 62, 44-54.

Lea, D.H., Sedlacek, W.E., & Stewart, S.S. Faculty attitudes toward resident and commuting students, Counseling Center Research Report # 5-77, University of Maryland, College Park, 1977.

Neugarten, B., Moore, J., & Lowe, J. Age norms, age constraints and adult socialization. American Journal of Sociology, 1965, 70, 710-717.

Osgood, C.E., Succi, G.J., & Tannenbaum, P.H. The measurement of meaning. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1957.

Rosen, B. and Jerdee, T.H. The nature of job-related age stereotypes. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1976, 61, 180-183.

Sakoda, J.M., Cohen, B.H., & Beall, G. Tests of significance for a series of statistical tests. Psychological Bulletin, 1954, 51, 172-175.

Sedlacek, W.E. and Brooks, G.C., Jr. The development of a measure of racial attitudes. Psychological Reports, 1970, 27, 971-980.

Sedlacek, W.E. and Brooks, G.C., Jr. The Situational Attitude Scale (SAS) Manual. Chicago: Natresources, Inc., 1972.

Srole, I. Social integration and certain corollaries: An exploratory study. American Sociological Review, 1956, 21, 709-716.

Troll, L. and Schlossberg, N. How "age-biased" are college counselors? Industrial Gerontology, 1971, 14-20.

Troll, L. and Schlossberg, N. Explorations in age bias: A preliminary investigation of age bias in the helping professions. Unpublished paper, 1974.

Tuchman, J. and Lorge, I. The attitudes of the aged toward the older worker; for institutionalized and non-institutionalized adults. Journal of Gerontology, 1952a, 7, 559-564.